

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-7, 23, and 29-32 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the interview given on April 14, 2005. During the interview, independent Claims 1 and 29 were discussed in light of the cited art, although no agreement as to allowance of any of the claims was reached. Nevertheless, the Examiner noted that he may need to require a species election between a continuous fiber and a cut fiber. If such a species election is required, the applicant would traverse the species requirement, however, provisionally elects initial examination of the species of the continuous fiber. Nevertheless, the Applicant notes that if including a continuous fiber is held to be allowable, that the claims reciting a cut fiber should also be allowed.

### **SPECIFICATION**

The Applicant has amended the specification to correct some minor typographical errors. As originally filed, in Example 2, it was noted that the alumina coated Silica Sol, given the trade name number 1056 by Nalco Chemicals, included a 20% solids composition. Nevertheless, one generally skilled in the art would know that the composition actually includes 30% solids, 26% as silicon dioxide and 4% as alumina. Such concentrations are referenced the Advanced Technical Data Sheet (Tab A) from Nalco Chemical Company that is clearly dated before the filing date of the present application.

Similarly, under Example 3, the Silica Sol given the trade number 2327 by Nalco Chemicals was incorrectly noted to include only 20% solids. Nevertheless, one skilled in the art would understand, according to the technical sheets (Tab B) provided by Nalco Chemicals, that the Silica Sol would actually include a solids concentration of 40% as silicon dioxide.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that the amendments to the Specification do not include new subject matter and one skilled in the art would clearly understand that the concentrations originally given were incorrect and that the new concentrations are correct as illustrated in the brochures and materials from the supplier of the named products. Therefore, the Applicants submit that such amendments are proper and request that they be made to the present application.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-7 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2 and 3 have been non-narrowingly amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection. Therefore, the Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under Section 112 to Claims 2 and 3.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to indicate that the sol gel and the alumina particles can be mixed and the mixture can surround a ceramic fiber.

Therefore, the Applicant submits that the rejection under Section 112 should be removed and requests that the Examiner do so.

Claim 23 recites that "said sol gel includes a solids content of about 20 weight percent." This depends from independent Claim 1 which recites that a sol gel can comprise about 10 wt% to about 60 wt%. Therefore, the Applicants submit that dependent Claim 23 narrows the range originally cited in independent Claim 1.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-4 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kalinowski (U.S. Pat. No. 5,129,919). Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carman (U.S. Patent No. 5,160,509). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Both Kalinowski and Carman disclose a composition for forming a slurry. In particular, Kalinowski describes an abrasive material that includes sintering a sol gel and then forming an abrasive material from the sintered sol gel. Carman merely describes that a medium can be heated which burns off a material that acts as a blank to form an abrasive wheel. Therefore, neither Kalinowski nor Carman teach or fairly suggest the composition recited in either of independent Claims 1 or 29. For example, neither Kalinowski nor Carman disclose a ceramic fiber or a plurality of ceramic fibers where a mixture surrounds the ceramic fiber or the mixture is infiltrated into the plurality of the ceramic fibers. Therefore, the compositions of Kalinowski and Carman do not anticipate each of the elements of independent Claims 1 or 29.

Because Kalinowski and Carman do not anticipate each of the elements of independent Claims 1 or 29, each of the independent claims are in condition for allowance, including each of the claims that depend directly or indirectly therefrom.

#### **CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

4/15/05

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Michael L. Taylor  
Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MLT